OALsABDc UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, New York, N.Y. 4 20 CR 677 (AT) v. 5 CHOLO ABDI ABDULLAH, 6 Defendant. 7 -----x 8 October 21, 2024 11:15 a.m. 9 Before: 10 11 HON. ANALISA TORRES, 12 District Judge 13 **APPEARANCES** 14 DAMIAN WILLIAMS United States Attorney for the 15 Southern District of New York NICHOLAS BRADLEY 16 JONATHAN BODANSKY 17 Assistant United States Attorneys 18 CHOLO ABDI ABDULLAH Pro Se Defendant 19 20 ALSO PRESENT: KARLOFF COMMISSIONG, Standby Counsel 21 CHRISTINE DELINCE, Standby Counsel EMILEE SAHLI, Standby Counsel SABRINA JIM MUNOZ, USAO Paralegal Specialist 22 23 2.4 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

1.3

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

(Case called)

THE COURT: Good morning. We're here in the matter of United States v. Cholo Abdi Abdullah.

Would you make your appearances, please.

MR. BRADLEY: Good morning, your Honor.

Nicholas Bradley and Jonathan Bodansky for the government, along, at counsel table, with Sabrina Jim, paralegal specialist.

MR. COMMISSIONG: Good morning, your Honor.

Karloff Commissiong, Christine Delince, and Emilee Sahli, standby counsel.

THE DEFENDANT: Cholo Abdi Abdullah, the defendant.

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Mr. -- is it -- Abdullah, or Abdullah?

THE DEFENDANT: Abdullah.

THE COURT: Mr. Abdullah, you stated when we had a conference on November 21, 2023, that you speak, read, and write English, although Boorana and Swahili are your primary languages.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.

THE COURT: You are not requesting the services of an interpreter, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.

THE COURT: So you don't want an interpreter today,

1 | correct?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE DEFENDANT: Correct.

THE COURT: And you don't want an interpreter for the trial, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Correct.

THE COURT: You also stated on that day that you have a college diploma, specifically a degree in journalism, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.

THE COURT: I would like to begin today's conference by reviewing your rights with respect to counsel.

During that hearing on November 21 of last year, after an extended discussion of your right to be represented by counsel and your right to represent yourself, I found that you knowingly and intelligently, voluntarily, and unequivocally waived your right to be represented by a lawyer in this case.

I relieved your court-appointed attorneys and I appointed Mr. Commissiong --

Am I saying that correctly, sir?

MR. COMMISSIONG: Yes, you are.

THE COURT: -- standby counsel, to assist you in your representation of yourself.

As I explained to you at that conference, you do not have an absolute right to withdraw your request to represent yourself. I also explained that if you do represent yourself,

2.4

you don't have an absolute right to reject the standby counsel appointed by the court, though you are, of course, free to ignore standby counsel's advice.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: I would also like to remind you, with trial beginning next week, that you do not have the right to what is known as hybrid representation. You have the choice to either represent yourself and be in control of how you present your case or a lawyer will represent you in this matter. You cannot freely move back and forth between these two poles.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Correction. There is a correction, because when on the last year when I was here, I explained clearly to the court that my intention was not to represent myself, but to waive the right of the legal counsel, but to remain passive in the case without any participation. That is what I told the court clearly, I'm not representing myself or presenting the evidence or presenting the defense. This is what I told the court last year in the last conference we had.

THE COURT: That is my understanding. You had said that, essentially, you would remain in the courtroom, but not do anything.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: That is correct.

THE COURT: So, if at any point your standby counsel -- and I'm not saying this is going to happen -- but if you change your mind at any point and your standby counsel starts to take on an active role by serving as your attorney instead of acting as standby counsel, either at your invitation or with your acquiescence, you may lose your right to complain about the lawyers' role after the fact.

In other words, I will presume that the active participation by the lawyer -- and, that is, if that happens -- is with your permission and that the lawyer, not you, is putting on a defense, which means that you will have less control over tactical decisions, questioning witnesses, arguments, and objections.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand. But that is what I told the court last year, that I will remain passive in the court during the trial.

But there is another possibility of questioning some witnesses that I think might be beneficial to me at the trial. Also, this possibility, that I am deliberating on it.

THE COURT: All right. So, as I said, you have the right to do that, and Mr. Commissiong, who is a very well-qualified attorney, can give you advice about that and you could take his advice or not take his advice. You can chat with him or ignore him. But what you cannot do is just decide

that you want to do some of the questions and then he'll do some of the questions.

THE DEFENDANT: No, no.

THE COURT: It would have to be you doing it by yourself if you want to remain as a self-represented defendant.

Do you understand what I'm saying?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: So, let's say that during the course of the trial you decide that you want to question some witnesses and you're talking to him and he's giving you very good ideas. And you say to yourself, well, maybe it would be a good idea for him to start asking these questions or making objections. Well, once he starts that, then he becomes your lawyer, and you lose your right to be self-represented.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: We did go over this on the last, at the last conference. You explained to me vividly that anyone who takes a position, that's it. If they, in some ways, standby lawyers and they take position of asking even one question, then they take the lead, your Honor.

So, I understand it. I would never, you know, I would never mislead the court. This is what I told the court that I am going to, you know, kind of remain passive in this case, or maybe even if I participate next week, that's up to me.

But what is clear for me that I will tell the court,

2.4

that I told the court before, that they are not going to participate in this case.

THE COURT: OK. And I have to, even though you made that very clear, very, very clear, I need to remind you of your rights because, under our Constitution, it is very, very important that you understand your rights.

Finally, I must remind you that if you use the power of self-representation to deliberately engage in serious and obstructionist misconduct, you will lose the right to represent yourself and a lawyer will be appointed to present your defense, even if you do not want a lawyer.

Now, I'm not saying that that will happen. You have been a perfect gentleman every time that you've been in the courtroom. But if you should engage in any form of misconduct which undermines the orderly proceeding of the trial, then you may lose that right to be self-represented. That's in accordance with Faretta v. California, 422 U.S. 806, 834, n.46 (1975). You must follow the rules of courtroom protocol and maintain proper decorum. You must, for example, follow the rules of evidence and obey any ruling that I make or have made in this case.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: I previously explained to you the dangers and disadvantages of proceeding without a lawyer to represent

you.

OALsABDc

I now reiterate that it is better for you to be represented by a lawyer. You are at an extreme disadvantage if you represent yourself. The prosecution, not only the lawyers that are sitting here, they have got dozens of lawyers back in their office who can help them during the trial. And they have a great deal of experience. They are experts in the law. And, for me, you are putting yourself in a very dangerous position by going up against these very experienced lawyers by yourself and not being represented by a lawyer.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand that, that part, your Honor. I believe that for me taking the lead is putting me in a disadvantaged position. This is clear.

But I believe that, you know, this decision is lesser evil. That I explained to the court before, your Honor, I have never explained to you reasons why I've made this decision because of you, you know, you asked me about aliases. And that is something that is clear to me, that I have, you know, I have a lot of reasons behind this -- this decision, and I never tell the court. I just keep it to myself. Maybe I just keep it to myself. This is maybe, you know, just speaking without knowledge, people might accuse me of speaking without knowledge or, you know, I'm kind of a maniac or something.

Something is clear to me that you, your Honor, you have treated me well. I came to you here three times before

changing the lawyers. I told you before about the lawyer, that we just come here again, because this is what I know, that someone of my status will never get any legal service from the public attorneys.

Maybe if I might have financially capabilities of having a private lawyer, there would be no problem. But the public attorneys, the public defenders, your Honor, they will never represent me. They will never give equal service. They are going to do things that might even, you know, physically harm you.

This is something that I have observed, and this is a decision that is a rational decision, your Honor. But I have never gone into the greater details of explaining why I made this decision. This is a lesser evil, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, I respect your decision, but I do want you to know that I disagree with you with regard to lawyers that are appointed to represent you as opposed to lawyers that you are paying.

Mr. Commissiong enjoys an excellent reputation in this courtroom, and in the rest of the courthouse, for his expert knowledge of the law and his very high quality of his advocacy. And so you are not getting a lawyer that is less than. If anything, you are getting a lawyer who is more than, better than others. So just keep that in mind.

But based on our discussion, is it your intention to

continue representing yourself with the assistance of the standby counsel?

THE DEFENDANT: If you would allow me, your Honor, to waive the right for the standby counsel, I will waive it. But before I tell you, I cannot do it. This is my decision.

THE COURT: OK. All right. Yes.

Do any of the attorneys have any other questions that they would like me to put to Mr. Abdullah regarding the *Faretta* rights?

MR. BRADLEY: No, your Honor.

MR. COMMISSIONG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: The government filed motions in limine on September 23. The court did not receive any response or opposition to the government's motion from Mr. Abdullah.

Mr. Abdullah, did you receive a copy of the government's motions in limine?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. I apologize to the court for not replying because I didn't have enough stamps to send. I have some objections to what -- to the motions, some objections, but I didn't have stamps, you know, postal stamps to send the letter to the court. So this is the reason why I didn't reply.

THE COURT: So you still have an opportunity to make your objections, and certainly the easiest way would be to make them, you saying, Mr. Commissiong's ability to communicate with the court electronically.

OALsABDC

23

24

25

1 Mr. Commissiong, are you aware of objections? I'm not asking for the specific objections, but are 2 3 you aware of the objections that Mr. Abdullah has? MR. COMMISSIONG: 4 I am. 5 THE COURT: So, Mr. Abdullah, you can make those objections at this time. There is no problem in your doing 6 7 that. 8 Mr. Commissiong, did you want to say something? 9 MR. COMMISSIONG: No. 10 THE COURT: So would you like to make your objections 11 now? 12 THE DEFENDANT: That was my, you know, that is -- I 13 wanted to make those objections now. 14 THE COURT: OK. 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. 16 THE COURT: So then I will hear you on your 17 objections. If you could just go one by one. 18 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, one of the objection is 19 prejudice. For example, the government, they are going to 20 introduce some of Al Shabaab propaganda, graphic videos, that 21 they are going to show it to the jury. That is going to 22 greatly affect the decision-making capabilities of the jurors.

prejudice. For example, the government, they are going to introduce some of Al Shabaab propaganda, graphic videos, that they are going to show it to the jury. That is going to greatly affect the decision-making capabilities of the jurors. Because, for example, according to my understanding, the Al Shabaab, they are connected to the military wing. So they are using those videos as psychological mafia. So the

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

2.4

government also, they are using the same videos as psychological, you know, to psychologically manipulate the decision-making capabilities of the juries.

And I have -- I don't have much objection to the propaganda videos, but the main that's -- and also are connected with this case is, you know, there is a footage of a suicide bomber that we should explore. This footage, even those who are exposed to -- exposed to the values, it stops them if they look at it. So they see videos, you know, they jurors might, according to my assumptions, they will be civilians. It might greatly affect their psychological, and also they could be prejudiced if they look at it. It might affect the decision-making when they have to make a verdict. So they are going to manipulate the verdict.

Another objection in the same propaganda videos is the Dusit, DusitD2, the footage of the propaganda Al Shabaab video. This, I don't have much objection to this, but I want the government to cut, I think, the first zero minute until, like, I think, you know, there is a part that when the video starts, there is a part that there is a shooting, there is people running. So I want them to cut that part.

I understand from where, you know, the reporter is talking. I don't care --

THE COURT: So I just want to take these one by one. In the first, your first complaint is that you feel

that the Al Shabaab videos will inflame the jury, that it would be -- the prejudice would be excessive to you.

Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: That's correct.

THE COURT: OK. Now, you mentioned a specific part where there is a suicide bomber. Are you saying that you want that cut out, or you want no videos all together?

THE DEFENDANT: No. There is two videos of the Dusit, connected with the DusitD2 attack.

One video is not propaganda. This one video is a CCTV footage that was provided by the KN government. This CCTV footage is for the attack, suicide bomber exploding himself. The government already produce it, so I want them to not introduce this one. Not to use it at all.

And also there is --

THE COURT: OK. Let's just take one at a time.

Are you saying, in that particular video, you want them to cut out the suicide bomber or you don't want the video all together?

THE DEFENDANT: Because the video, all of it is five minute, and all five minute is about the suicide bomber. So I don't want them to use it at all.

THE COURT: OK. So I want to ask the government whether or not, indeed, it intends to use a video that depicts a suicide bomber exploding himself.

MR. BRADLEY: We do, your Honor.

And as the government explained in its motions in limine, there really -- I think I understand Mr. Abdullah. There are really two videos. The first focusing on the CCTV footage of the suicide bomber in the Dusit attack. This is one very limited piece that the government explained it intended to offer.

One of the reasons why it is significant, your Honor, is because the defendant, indeed, searched for leaked CCTV footage of suicide bomber Nairobi almost contemporaneously with the Dusit attack as it happened and then visited a website describing how that video was leaked.

In many respects, corroborates the defendant's involvement in knowledge of Al Shabaab's operations, including the targeting of Americans. And I believe the court in its rulings, I think, very carefully balanced the potential prejudicial effect and how, under Second Circuit law, videos such as this are directly probative in cases involving terrorism such as this.

THE COURT: One moment, please.

(Pause)

Mr. Abdullah, then I understand that you object to a portion of the video where there is an individual firing a gun and people running, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, that is correct.

2.4

There is Al Shabaab propaganda video that was released by Al Shabaab that, from the beginning, there is gunshots and people are running. This part, I want them to remove this part. But about the American, anti-American sentiment, or the sentiment that the reporter expresses, I don't care about this. They can introduce. But what I don't want is something that is going to psychologically affect the jurors.

THE COURT: And, so, I understand the government does want to use that portion of the video, is that correct?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Do you have any other responses to their motions in limine?

THE DEFENDANT: It's -- there is another -- there is another objection of using the CC-1 and the CC-2 and the CC-3. These are the coconspirators that the government are intending to introduce at the trial, their communication with each other.

Your Honor, I object to this because the first thing that they have to prove is that they have to prove these people are actually members of Al Shabaab. So, if their names is not known, they must prove that these people are connected with Al Shabaab. And using the statement against me, I think, your Honor, goes against the hearsay...

THE COURT: Rule.

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. There is no way that it's not, that we ever met, and this -- this statement is, the government

OALsABDc

submission that we exchange with each other, but the statement that, for example, CC-1 and CC-3 exchange with each other or the statement that the CC-1 and CC-2 exchanged with each other, this is something that I would like, I would like to object to the introducing.

THE COURT: So, you're saying that you're objecting because the government has not tied you to those individuals, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Correction, your Honor.

It's not -- they are trying to connect me with them, you know, from the beginning. But what I'm trying to object is that these people are not, first of all, they are not convicted. Also, they are not, they are not known. No one knows where they are, so using against me.

Also, for example, the Facebook that they are using maybe, for example, if this Facebook using allegedly is fake names or fake e-mails. So this is something that they must first, the main thing, they must first prove that these people are members of Al Shabaab to use this statement against me. This is something have to be, they must be convicted first.

Your Honor, give me one second, please.

(Defendant confers with standby counsel)

Your Honor, correction.

The government, when they say that the e-mail, the one I sent, allegedly the Google search for the CCTV, they say that

it was the same day of the attack. But, actually, if you -- according to the evidence that the government has produced, it was two days later.

And also, one thing that, the main thing that the government, they have to do, is that they must -- you know, they must prove before the court without a reasonable doubt that those CC-1, CC-2, and CC-3 are actually members of Al Shabaab. The government, they have refused, you know, they denied it. They have refused to unclassify, the classified, the names, even the names of those guys. So, they don't even know whether they are members of Al Shabaab, so how can they use, you know, hearsay, the rules, against me, your Honor?

THE COURT: So, because I did not receive any objections from you, I issued an opinion on October 16.

My understanding is that you received that, correct?

THE DEFENDANT: No, they just give me now.

THE COURT: Oh, I see.

All right. So I'm going to give you an opportunity to read my opinion at this time. We'll take a brief pause.

(Recess)

All right. So, Mr. Abdullah, you have had the opportunity to read my decision on the motions in limine dated October 16 and have had the opportunity to discuss it with Mr. Commissiong, and I am adhering to my decisions in that order, having considered your arguments.

25

1 The government also submitted proposed questions for 2 potential jurors, proposed jury instructions, and a proposed 3 verdict form. 4 Mr. Abdullah, have you received copies of these 5 submissions? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. 7 THE COURT: And I did not receive any response from 8 you. 9 Do you intend to respond to these questions for the 10 jurors? 11 The main thing that I would like you, THE DEFENDANT: the government to add to those questions is, you know, the 12 13 government, according to their motions to charge, is that they 14 are trying to portray this case as, like, an antisemitic trial. 15 So, I would like you to question the jurors whether they support either side, you know, the Palestinian side or the 16 17 Israeli side, so to be fair. 18 THE COURT: You want me to ask the jurors whether they 19 support Israel in general? 20 Because Israeli have a number of different opinions 21 about their politics. 22 THE DEFENDANT: No. 23 I would like you to ask the question, neither of both 24 sides, I don't want them to -- the jurors who support the

Palestinian side or the jurors who support the Israeli side,

they should not be -- they should not be jury on this trial.

Because this trial is portrayed, like, you know, the Jerusalem will be Judaized, and the government, they are claiming that I am one of the Jerusalem brigade. This is what they are trying to present before the trial.

So I want the court -- I know it's unusual, because you are not supposed to judge people in that way, but this is how they want to use the court, and I want the jurors to be free from both sentiments.

THE COURT: Are you saying that you want me to ask whether jurors have a bias in favor of Israel or a bias in favor of the Palestinians?

THE DEFENDANT: That is correct.

THE COURT: Does the prosecution have anything to say on his claim that you are trying to portray him as an anti-semite?

MR. BRADLEY: I think we would strongly disagree with that, your Honor. I think from the motions in limine, I think it's very clear that the case that the government intends to put forth to the jury is that the defendant's actions were set in the context of an Al Shabaab operation known as Operation Jerusalem will never be Judaized, which was in response, by something that Al Shabaab took as an initiative in response to the decision in 2008 for the United States to relocate its mission to Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem.

I don't believe Al Shabaab's statements, while certainly making reference to Zionism, Crusaders, and also the anti-American, yes, I believe would, I think, certainly be hostile to the Jewish state. But I think primarily the case that the government intends to proceed on at trial is that the defendant was part of a conspiracy with Al Shabaab to harm Americans.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Abdullah, with regard to questions for the jurors?

THE DEFENDANT: That's the only thing.

THE COURT: OK. So, with regard to the proposed jury instructions, what I would like you to do is to submit any objections that you have in writing. I will give you a deadline for that shortly. I'm not going to give you the deadline today.

I will take under consideration your request with respect to the questions that I will pose to the jury. I'm not making a ruling on that today.

MR. BRADLEY: Your Honor, just to maybe, perhaps, clarify a little bit.

In paragraph 40 of our proposed examination of potential jurors, we do note that one of our proposed questions to the court was essentially asking the jury pool that the case relates to violent conflicts involving several regions and countries that include Israel as well.

So, to the extent that Israel is one of many, you know, one of other considerations or factors or something that is going to be raised at trial, I do think we do mention it in our request to charge. We certainly will take into consideration the defendant's proposed contribution as well.

THE COURT: Well, he has already made his argument.

MR. BRADLEY: Correct. I understand that he may put something in writing in response to the court's deadline.

THE COURT: No, no. I'm not asking for a written submission with regard to the questions to the jury. I'm asking for a written submission with respect to the jury instructions.

MR. BRADLEY: Understood.

THE COURT: So, if you have anything further to say about the questions to the jurors, let me know now.

MR. BRADLEY: No, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: OK. The government previously estimated that the trial would last three weeks.

What is the government's current estimate?

MR. BRADLEY: I think, your Honor, some of it will depend on whether there is a defense case. I think that two and a half weeks is probably the best estimate from the government's perspective, taking into account the court's trial day.

One other scheduling question that the government had,

just from our perspective in terms of witness travel, was we were just not sure if the court was going to sit on election day, November 5, just because it is a federal holiday.

THE COURT: Of course not.

MR. BRADLEY: Thank you, your Honor. I just wanted to clarify.

So I think, based on that, we would be tracking toward approximately two and a half weeks with an eye toward hopefully getting it done quicker than that.

THE COURT: So trial is currently scheduled to begin next Monday, October 28.

During jury selection and jury deliberation, we will go from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. with a break between 1:00 and 2:00 p.m. Although, depending on how things go during jury selection, that might fall a little bit earlier, a little bit later. There will be a midday one-hour break during jury selection.

During the evidentiary portion of the trial, that is the part of the trial where we will have witnesses and other forms of evidence, we will be in session from 9:00 a.m. to 2:15 p.m., with a break from 11:15 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.

I'm going to repeat that.

Once we start the evidentiary portion of the trial, we will go from 9:00 a.m. to 2:15 p.m., with a break from 11:15 a.m. to 11:45 a.m.

```
1
               Does either side request that the jurors be anonymous
      and/or semi-sequestered?
 2
 3
               MR. BRADLEY: No, your Honor.
 4
               (Defendant confers with standby counsel)
 5
               Your Honor, I apologize. The government, just given
      the subject matter of the trial, I think the government would
 6
7
      at least respectfully request an anonymous jury.
                                                         In other
      words, not using their names in open court during the jury
8
 9
      selection process.
10
               THE COURT: So, you're looking for anonymity, but not
      for semi-sequestration?
11
12
               MR. BRADLEY: Correct.
13
               (Defendant confers with standby counsel)
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I would like to clarify to
15
     better the question that you just asked right now.
               THE COURT: You're saying you would like me to clarify
16
17
     my question?
18
               THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, yeah.
19
               THE COURT: So, typically when a jury is selected, the
20
      individuals who are part of the group of potential jurors,
21
      that's known as the panel, have a member of my staff call them
22
      out by name. So they would say, Herminia Rodriguez, Matthew
23
      Schwartz, etc.
2.4
               But when you have anonymous jurors, you do not use
25
                   They simply are not mentioned and, essentially, we
      their name.
```

OALsABDc 1 just go by number. 2 (Defendant confers with standby counsel) 3 THE DEFENDANT: I don't have any --Wait a minute. 4 5 (Defendant confers with standby counsel) Your Honor, I would prefer to the court use their 6 7 names. THE COURT: Does the prosecution have anything to say 8 9 about that? 10 MR. BRADLEY: I'm not sure I quite heard. 11 THE COURT: He said he would prefer that names be used 12 for the jurors. 13 MR. BRADLEY: The government wouldn't have any 14 objection to names being provided to the defendant and the 15 government during the jury selection, as long as they weren't 16 announced aloud in open court. 17 THE COURT: So he is pointing out that you would 18 actually be able to see their names. It is the public that 19 would not see their names or hear them. 20 THE DEFENDANT: Can the government please give the 21 reason why they want it to be like that? 22 MR. BRADLEY: Your Honor, we are happy to provide

MR. BRADLEY: Your Honor, we are happy to provide briefing to the court on this issue, but given the subject matter, the fact that this is a terrorism case, the fact that the subject matter involves allegations that the defendant

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

conspired with others to murder Americans and given the sensitivity of the subject matter, we believe it would be appropriate for the names to not be, at least, read in open court, even if the defendant himself has access to the names.

THE COURT: Anything further, Mr. Abdullah?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. Eventually they are going to provide me with the names? I'm going to get names?

> I'll be providing you with the names. THE COURT:

THE DEFENDANT: You're going to provide them with the I am going to know their names?

THE COURT: You will definitely know their names.

THE DEFENDANT: So why they don't want you to announce their names?

THE COURT: So he was just saying that, given the allegations in the case where you're accused of being involved in a conspiracy to kill Americans, the sensitive nature of that makes it preferable for us to have jurors whose names are not known to the public, but who will be known to you. That is the argument that they are making.

Am I correct?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, your Honor.

(Defendant confers with standby counsel)

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I think their names, according to my opinion, their names should be pronounced, should be pronounced aloud before the court, before the public.

But that decision should be on the jurors. They should be told your names are going to be pronounced before the court. If you want to be in this court, in this trial, then it's up to you. You know, so let that be their decision.

THE COURT: OK. So my decision is that I am going to have an anonymous jury panel, given the nature of the case.

So, jury selection will not take place here in this courtroom. It's going to be in courtroom 23A. That's Judge Stein's courtroom. The remainder of the trial will be here in courtroom 15D.

We are going to seat 12 jurors and four alternates.

My law clerk is now going to hand out a jury pool sheeting chart so that you will know where the members of the panel will be seated.

So what you do not see here on the papers that were just handed to you are Jurors 1 through 18. They will be seated in the jury box during the jury selection process. That will be a separate piece of paper.

What you do see here is how the potential jurors will be seated in the benches of the courtroom. So in the lower left, you see Juror No. 19. So that's that first bench on the left, all the way on the left side. That's where Juror No. 19 will be, and that bench will be filled through number 24. But then you see that there is a space in between that represents the aisle, and then the next juror will be in the next bench to

the right.

2.4

OALsABDc

Any questions about the seating arrangement?

MR. BRADLEY: No, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: OK. My next question, Mr. Abdullah, is whether you will be participating in sidebar conversations.

What happens during jury selection is that sometimes I will ask a question that may be sensitive, maybe it is not appropriate for the individual to answer in public, and that person needs to speak to me and the lawyers typically in private.

Now, you're representing yourself, and so the question is whether or not you would like to be included in those private discussions. Because we will have you come forward and we will have, like, a huddle.

THE DEFENDANT: Will the marshals, will the marshals, according to the marshal protocol, the standard procedures of marshals, will they allow me for me to come near you?

THE COURT: I'm in charge here, not the marshals, so it's my decision as to whether you are part of the huddle or not. And my decision is that you may be a part of that huddle. The question is merely whether it's going to be taking place here in the courtroom or in the robing room.

THE DEFENDANT: The question is will the marshals escort me? Will the marshals available, will they escort me?

OALsABDC

THE COURT: So we have to figure out a way of doing it so that the members of the public are not conscious of their presence around you. We have to do it in a way that is discrete. So, if you did participate, we have to figure out a way for you to participate and not to have attention drawn to the fact that there are marshals involved.

THE DEFENDANT: I have no objection.

THE COURT: So the question is, would you plan to participate in those private conversations?

In other words, you have the option of staying in your seat when the lawyers come up or coming up yourself.

THE DEFENDANT: I'm going to get involved.

THE COURT: OK. I'm going to have to discuss with the marshals how that will be arranged.

So I want to talk about the peremptory strikes.

Mr. Commissiong, have you explained peremptory strikes to Mr. Abdullah?

MR. COMMISSIONG: We have not had that discussion, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. So each side, after hearing the answer from the potential jurors, has the opportunity to object to a given juror. Now, that objection could be based upon an answer that shows that they are not qualified to be a juror. So, for example, if an individual says, I have a very serious disease, I cannot sit in a courtroom and listen to a trial,

it's just not possible. I will be in excruciating pain. That person has given a reason why they should be disqualified.

But a person might also give an answer that shows they have bias on one side or the other. A person could answer, I want you to know that my husband is a prosecutor and I will always side with the prosecution. Or a person could say, I come from the same country as Mr. Abdullah and I will always side with somebody from my country. Those types of answers that show bias, those disqualify a person from serving as a juror because a juror must be able to say, I'm going to be fair and impartial.

So, during the first part of the jury selection process, we will eliminate or discharge jurors that clearly are disqualified to serve as jurors for one reason or another. But then you have an opportunity to reject jurors that you feel, for whatever reason, are not appropriate for this case. And assuming that your reason does not violate the Constitution, so, for example, you could not reject a juror because of their race or religion or their gender, but you could reject a juror because, sizing up the individual, you simply feel that that person is not desirable for your case. These are called peremptory strikes.

So, for the defense -- rather, for the first 12 jurors, the government gets six peremptory challenges. In other words, they have the opportunity to reject six of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

potential jurors, and you have the opportunity to reject ten of the potential jurors.

Are you following me?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Good.

Then we will have four alternate jurors. Each side gets two additional peremptory challenges. In other words, two additional people that you may reject for a reason that does not violate the Constitution.

So, we are going to handle the peremptory strikes in a way that is not typically done in this courthouse, so let me explain. We will start with the prosecution, and you can exercise all of your strikes in the first round if you want to. We will examine the first 12 eligible jurors. Then the defense will look at that group of 12 and decide whether to exercise a peremptory strike with respect to that first group of 12.

Once each side has exercised their strikes of that first 12, then we are going to take the next 12. And, once again, you can exercise as many strikes as you like in that second group of 12. So we will go back and forth until we get 12 jurors and four alternates.

Any questions?

MR. BRADLEY: No, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: OK. So what I do want you to understand

is that, let us say in the first group of 12, the prosecution exercises four strikes, and then in the second group they exercise one strike and they still have a strike left, well, you cannot go backwards to the first or second group.

Do you follow me?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: I would like to address additional questions and issues.

The government is directed to order daily transcripts. I do not permit speaking objections during the trial. And by this, Mr. Abdullah, I mean, if you want to make an objection, you may decide that you want to make an objection because you feel that a rule of evidence has been violated. You will state objection, but you will not say the reason. You will not say this violates the rule against hearsay. You merely say objection.

Does everybody understand what I'm saying?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: If, for some reason, I cannot figure out why you're making the objection, then I will have a sidebar conversation. But, most of the time, I will understand why you're making the objection and I will say sustained or overruled.

2.4

Sustained means that I agree with the objection and an answer will not be permitted from the witness. And if I overrule the objection, then the answer may go forward. Or if an answer has already been given, it would stand. If an answer has already been given before the objection and I sustained it, then that is going to be stricken from the record.

Mr. Abdullah, I want you to know that you are not required to wear prison clothing during the trial. Most defendants in this courthouse request that they be allowed to use regular, non-prison clothes, such as a suit and tie or similar clothing because, of course, you want to make the best impression that you can on the jurors.

So I would grant your request, if you ask, that you would like to wear non-prison clothing, and I could not enforce you to wear prison clothing. And so if you want to wear non-prison clothing, you need to tell me because I have to issue a written order to the prison directing that the officials there allow you to come in regular non-prison clothing.

Do you understand what I'm saying?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand what you're saying.

THE COURT: Do you have a decision on that?

THE DEFENDANT: I would prefer a prison uniform, your

Honor.

THE COURT: You understand that I'm not allowed to

24

25

If it's

force you to wear the prison uniform? 1 2 You understand that, right? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I understand that part. 4 THE COURT: And so it's your intention to be in the 5 courtroom wearing prison-issued clothing; is that correct? THE DEFENDANT: That's correct. 6 7 THE COURT: I will find that the defendant knowingly intelligently and voluntarily waived his right to request that 8 9 I issue a clothing order. 10 Now, if you should change your mind between now and 11 Thursday, then you would have to submit a written request. 12 Mr. Commissiong, you have a way of communicating with 13 Mr. Abdullah, don't you? 14 The short answer is yes, your Honor. MR. COMMISSIONG: 15 THE COURT: So he has a way of communicating with you, 16 is that correct? 17 MR. COMMISSIONG: Yes, there is a way. 18 THE COURT: And what is that way? 19 MR. COMMISSIONG: We would schedule a call with the 20 MDC and they would bring him to the phone and we would speak to 21 him over the phone. 22 THE COURT: OK. So, if you change your mind, I need 23 to know by Thursday. And if it's the case --

amenable to your Honor, I would like to approach just briefly

MR. COMMISSIONG: Your Honor, just one thing.

with just one member of the prosecution team for a sidebar. 1 2 Is that agreeable to you, Mr. Abdullah, THE COURT: 3 that Mr. Commissiong approach me and that you remain seated 4 where you are? 5 THE DEFENDANT: Will that change my decision? 6 Like, for example, where you say the lawyers, they 7 want to step forward. That's it? 8 THE COURT: So his speaking to me now would not make 9 any impact on your decision to be self-represented. 10 THE DEFENDANT: I don't mind, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: OK. Please step up. 12 (At the sidebar) 13 MR. COMMISSIONG: I didn't know if this is something 14 you want on the record in open court, but we've had a lot of 15 changes in terms of speaking with him that are no fault of 16 ours. 17 As your Honor knows, he chose to remain passive, which 18 he said at the previous conference. And in choosing to remain 19 passive, there have been certain restrictions that he sort of placed on our communications with him. So we haven't been able 20 21 to meet with him in person. 22 THE COURT: Are you saying that he is rejecting 23 communication with you?

because, with respect to the question regarding peremptories,

MR. COMMISSIONG: He has, yes. I only mention it

2.4

25

OALsABDc

you asked if we had that conversation. The restrictions that we have had have prevented us from going into many aspects of this trial, and I just wanted your Honor to know that being the case.

THE COURT: Well, he has stated that he wants to represent himself and --

MR. COMMISSIONG: Absolutely.

THE COURT: -- I stated to him that he can ignore you.

Of course, that does not mean that you should not continue to make attempts to contact him despite his decision to ignore you.

MR. COMMISSIONG: Yes, and we have had calls that have been refused. And we've been, you know -- I'm trying to sort of still honor some sort of confidentiality. But to the extent that we have not seen him in person, it's not our doing.

THE COURT: I understand. I completely understand.

MR. COMMISSIONG: Or even contact via letter.

THE COURT: So I'm going to explain to him now that if he changes his mind and he wants to wear civilian clothes --

By the way, do you know if he has civilian clothing?

MR.COMMISSIONG: I do not. We had that conversation

with him. In fact, we had that conversation with him this

morning, just before coming here, and the decision he told your

Honor is what was explained to us.

THE COURT: If he changes his mind, would you be able

to provide him with clothing if he does not have it?

MR. COMMISSIONG: We would. We told him, you know, that we do have...

THE COURT: So I'm going to let him know that if he changes his mind, he has to communicate with you by Thursday.

And that you, for this purpose only, may communicate with me on that subject matter only.

MR. COMMISSIONG: OK.

THE COURT: And if he should decide, of course, that he wants civilian clothing, you will provide it.

MR. COMMISSIONG: OK.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. COMMISSIONG: Thank you, your Honor.

(In open court)

THE COURT: Mr. Abdullah, if you change your mind and you want to wear non-prison clothing, that means that on your own initiative you're going to have to contact Mr. Commissiong and communicate that to him, and you have to do that by Thursday.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I don't know what clothing you have other than what you're wearing. But if you don't have the clothing that you want to wear, you can let Mr. Commissiong know what kind of clothing that you want to wear. For example,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

you could say I would like to wear a button-down shirt with a Whatever it is that you would like to wear, you can sweater. let him know, and he will provide the clothing. But your deadline is Thursday. Do you understand? THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor. THE COURT: OK. THE DEFENDANT: One thing is, you know, I cannot groom, you know, like, comb my hair. Because in the prison where I am, they put me in high security, so they don't give us something to comb. So they can give us the clippers to cut the hair. You need a barber to cut, you know, to be look good. Ιf I want to cut my hair, I'm just going to even look much worser than I'm looking like now. So the point is, I would like the judge, you know, the court to issue an order for the prison to provide me even with, like, a comb so that when I come here, I just comb my hair. THE COURT: What about a visit to the barber. There is a barber in the facility, isn't there? THE DEFENDANT: No, they usually give us clippers.

Clippers, and you just cut your hair on your own.

You know, I understand, the solitary confinement, there is no contact.

THE COURT: So would you like to cut your own hair?

THE DEFENDANT: I would love to cut my hair, but if I

2.4

25

cut on my own -- you know, I cut my hair several times in the 1 2 prison. 3 THE COURT: Right. 4 THE DEFENDANT: They give us the clippers. 5 THE COURT: Right. THE DEFENDANT: I have tried. Your Honor, I look 6 7 miserable. I look worse than I look like now. But if I have a barber who is going to cut my hair --8 9 THE COURT: Yes. 10 THE DEFENDANT: -- it would be better. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Commissiong, do you understand what is 12 available as far as hair? 13 MR. COMMISSIONG: I think because of the restrictions, 14 he has no contact with anyone else in the facility. So going 15 to a barber is impossible based on the restrictions. I'm not -- those aren't restrictions that a request 16 17 from me, you know, can't surmount, so to speak. I think the 18 government would have to get involved with that request. 19 THE COURT: Is there a barber in the facility? 20 MR. COMMISSIONG: There are people who do cut hair. 21 don't know if there -- I don't know that that is an official 22 barber at the MDC, but there are people who are allowed to cut 23 other people's hair.

to court looking sharp, and I think that there is the potential

THE COURT: All right. Well, he has the right to come

for him to be perceived as unkempt with his current hair style. So we have to figure out a way of him getting a haircut.

I would like the prosecution to tell me by the end of the day how we're going to do that.

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. I am going to need from both sides a list of attorneys and paralegals who will be involved in the trial.

I understand, Mr. Abdullah, that you don't intend to have any attorneys or paralegals involved. But if you change your mind, you can let me know whether there will be attorneys and paralegals.

I need a list of potential witnesses and other individuals whose names might be mentioned during the trial, and a list of businesses or entities that may be mentioned during the trial, and a list of locations involved in the trial. I will read these lists to the potential jurors during jury selection. I'm going to ask them whether they know any of these individuals or are familiar with any of the businesses.

So, Mr. Abdullah, I need that list by Wednesday. So, if you're going to provide a list, once again, you're going to need to contact Mr. Commissiong for this purpose.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: So, the parties are responsible for knowing how to operate the AV system in the courtroom.

OALsABDC

Mr. Commissiong, if you are going to assist with that process, if Mr. Abdullah intends to submit any evidence that requires the use of any of the technological equipment, I'm going to call for you to be familiar with the system.

So, essentially, we would need a dress rehearsal from both sides so that you are completely familiar with both sides, so we do not have delays or glitches.

If there are any Wi-Fi or electronic device requests,

I need that by this Thursday.

Mr. Abdullah, have you received copies of the government's trial exhibits and statements or reports made by the government's witnesses or prospective witnesses?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I have received all except for the Friday, the one that was sent on the 18th. That is when I think I have a CD, but I did not have access because my computer that I have in my cell, you cannot -- it has no CD drive. So I have to go to the law library to use the prison computer to convert it to their hard drive.

I went on Saturday. They got a computer crash. The computer was not functioning, so I could not -- I didn't see it. I didn't see the content of the CD.

THE COURT: So you provided Mr. Abdullah with a CD one?

MR. BRADLEY: We provided on October 11, your Honor, an initial set of exhibits and 3500 materials. We then

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

provided an updated substantially completed set of materials on the 18th.

I did speak to Mr. Abdullah before the conference today in the presence of standby counsel. We are certain to understand that there is this technical issue with one of the computers that came up. We are certainly happy to raise that with the Bureau of Prisons' staff when we inquire about the haircut capabilities as well.

THE COURT: So, this is critical.

MR. BRADLEY: Yes.

THE COURT: We are starting trial in a week. He needs to be able to review those documents immediately.

MR. BRADLEY: Correct.

THE COURT: So I want to get an answer. I want to get a positive answer by the end of the day. I want to hear that they are going to ensure that they have working equipment so that he can review all of the voluminous evidence.

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: One additional.

THE COURT: Yes. Access, of course, on more than one day. There is no way a person can assimilate all that information in one sitting.

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, your Honor.

I would just note that I believe Mr. Abdullah also told me that he was able to view the initial set of exhibits on

the 11th, so he has had access to these materials. We'll just make sure that the facilities continue to be equipped and any tech issue that he identified is resolved.

THE COURT: So, once again, Mr. Abdullah, to the extent that you are having difficulties reviewing that material -- and it's very important that you review the material -- those difficulties should be communicated to Mr. Commissiong.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor, but there is one more problem with the computer.

You know, this computer before used to have, like, a software, a TRULINCS. We call it TRULINCS software that you can access, you know, the U.S. Constitution and other previous, you know, the cases that I must read. But for almost a year now this software was removed since I was here last year, your Honor. Last year, I mean the day, two days before Thanksgiving I was here for waiving the right for the new counsel. Since that time until today, the software is not functioning, so I cannot even read any laws in the computer.

THE COURT: So did you have West Law, is that what they gave you?

THE DEFENDANT: Huh?

THE COURT: There is a product called West Law.

THE DEFENDANT: No, no, your Honor. There is a room in our unit that has a computer, and in this computer there is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

2.4

25

a TRULINCS, that there is a -- you can access the prison information, for example, the warden's notifications, or you can even read the United States Constitution in that computer and also you can read the previous cases and stuff like that, something that is connected with the legal. I could not access any of those until today.

THE COURT: So are you saying that it's the equivalent of a digital law library?

THE DEFENDANT: That is correct.

THE COURT: But you were not permitted to access that until today?

THE DEFENDANT: No. If I want to go to law library, they permit me to go. In that law library, that computer, that software or that program was removed.

So I try -- I spoke to people responsible and I spoke to them about the computer. They say they are willing to fix it, but they never fix it, your Honor.

THE COURT: So he has to have access to this basic source material. So, once again, I'm going to require that the prosecution ensure that the BOP make these materials available, because if they are not made available, I will grant a continuance.

Understood?

MR. BRADLEY: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: By the morning of the first day of trial,

```
the parties must produce copies of all exhibits they may
1
 2
      introduce at trial. The court will accept digital copies.
                                                                   For
 3
      any exhibits produced in paper format, please provide two
 4
      copies to the court.
 5
               One moment, please.
 6
               (Pause)
7
               Are there any further applications?
 8
               MR. BRADLEY: Not from the government, your Honor.
 9
               THE COURT: And, Mr. Abdullah, when I use that word,
10
      which you'll hear during the trial, I'll ask if a party has an
11
      application. That means request, do you have a request for the
12
      court to do something.
13
               Do you understand?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: Did you want to say something,
16
      Mr. Commissiong?
17
               MR. COMMISSIONG: Can I just have a moment with him?
18
               THE COURT: Yes.
19
               MR. COMMISSIONG: OK.
20
               (Defendant confers with standby counsel).
21
               Your Honor, standby counsel would like us to know
22
      where you would like us to sit. Do you want us to sit here in
      counsel table?
23
2.4
               I know in some proceedings gone by with standby
```

counsel, sometimes standby counsel have been in the gallery or

seated right behind the defendant. 1 2 THE COURT: Well, I think that it's more practical, to 3 the extent that you want to give advice, that you be seated next to him. 4 5 MR. COMMISSIONG: OK. 6 THE COURT: And, of course, as I said before, 7 Mr. Abdullah, you can listen to what he has to say or ignore 8 him. 9 THE DEFENDANT: I understand. 10 THE COURT: OK. So that brings our conference to an 11 We will see you at 9:00 a.m. next Monday morning. 12 We will be getting a panel of 100 potential jurors, 13 and as a reminder, we will be in Judge Stein's courtroom, 23A. 14 Thank you. 15 (Adjourned) 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25